

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
March 14, 2006 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

1. Robert Atkinson	Chairman
2. John Jefferson	AT&T
3. Debra Jordan	BellSouth
4. Michael Altschul	CTIA
5. Jason Oxman	CompTel
6. Dena Hunter	Level 3 Communications, LLC
7. Aram Shumavon	NARUC - California
8. Hon. Jack Goldberg	NARUC – Connecticut
9. Hon. Curtis Stamp	NARUC – Iowa
10. Hon. Robert M. Clayton, III	NARUC - Missouri
11. Don Gray	NARUC – Nebraska
12. Christine Sealock Kelly	NARUC – New York
13. Philip McClelland	NASUCA - Pennsylvania
14. Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
15. Ray Strassburger	Nortel Networks
16. John McHugh	OPASTCO
17. Mary Retka	Qwest
18. Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
19. Anna Miller	T-Mobile USA, Inc.
20. Joseph Jackson	Verizon
21. Martin Hakim Din	Vonage Holdings Corp.

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Jean-Paul Emard	ATIS
Amy Putnam	PA
Faith Marcotte	Welch & Company

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Alternate DFO
 Deborah Blue, Assistant to the DFO
 Narda Jones, Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division
 Cheryl Callahan, Assistant Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division
 Sanford Williams, Attorney, Telecommunications Access Policy Division
 James Bachtell, Attorney, Telecommunications Access Policy Division
 Renee Crittendon, Chief, Competition Policy Division
 Ann Stevens, Associate Chief, Competition Policy Division
 Heather Hendrickson, Attorney, Competition Policy Division
 Mary McManus, Attorney, Wireline Competition Bureau
 Amy Bender, Attorney, Wireline Competition Bureau

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 30 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Minutes – November 30, 2005
- (3) NANC Meeting Minutes – January 24, 2006
- (4) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (5) FCC 06-14 Thousands Block Number Pooling Authority
- (6) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report
- (7) North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report to the NANC
- (8) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (9) Billing and Collection Agent Report to the NANC
- (10) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (11) NANC Operating Manual - Final
- (12) Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (13) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (14) List of NANC Accomplishments (January 2002 – March 14, 2006)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING)
COUNCIL MEETING)

Tuesday,
March 14, 2006

Live Tape

(The following transcript was transcribed from an audiocassette tape provided by the Federal Communications Commission to Heritage Reporting Corporation on April 7, 2006.

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. ATKINSON: Good morning. I'd like to
3 call the meeting to order, and we have an agenda, so
4 the first item on the agenda would be to see if there
5 are any additions or changes to the agenda. And I
6 have one which under Agenda Item 12 there is the
7 sub-bullet including report of pANI IMG. We're going
8 to drop that item from discussion today. We'll have a
9 telephone conference call when that subject is ripe,
10 so stay tuned for the conference call.

11 Are there any other changes, additions,
12 corrections to the agenda? Seeing none, we'll adopt
13 the agenda, and that becomes Document No. 1.

14 For a substantive item, announcements and
15 recent news I've got a few, so let me go through those
16 real quickly. First, Jack Goldberg has graciously
17 agreed to become the co-chair of NANC, and I think
18 that's great because it's important to have someone,
19 when my train is late or we need some help, and Jack's
20 got a great background in all this stuff, and I know
21 that if I'm certainly not able to attend a meeting,
22 the meeting will be in great hands, so I appreciate
23 Jack's willingness to serve. Thank you very much.

24 Item No. 2, Phil McClelland, as you probably
25 saw from one of his messages, this is his last

1 meeting. Phil is a real part of the institutional
2 memory of NANC, and he will be very much missed in
3 terms of both his substantive input and I'd say the
4 institutional memory, so Phil thank you very much and
5 best wishes in future endeavors, et cetera.

6 (Applause.)

7 Item 3 on my list there's going to be some
8 changes in the FCC relationship slightly between NANC.
9 Historically, NANC has been under the umbrella of the
10 Telecommunications Access Policy Division. That's
11 going to be shifted over to the Policy Division.

12 I guess NANC is starting to get into some
13 policy matters, maybe VoIP and such things like that
14 always seem to be popping up on our agenda, but in any
15 case, that transition is in a sense underway. There
16 are a number of folks from the Policy Division over
17 here. I see Ann Stevens who I've known from my
18 previous time here, and, Ann, you are going to be
19 involved with this motley group, right?

20 MS. STEVENS: Yes, and Renee Crittendon.

21 MR. ATKINSON: Renee Crittendon is the Chief
22 of the Competition Policy Division.

23 MS. STEVENS: Mary McManus.

24 MR. ATKINSON: Mary McManus. Right.

25 MS. STEVENS: And Heather Hendrickson.

1 MR. ATKINSON: Heather. Okay. We'll get
2 all the names and faces straight, so we'll be working
3 with this group and we've got the old group still
4 here, Cheryl and Marilyn, and we'll figure it all out.
5 But in fact what we'll try to do is put out a little
6 piece of paper that explains who the players are et
7 cetera, et cetera, but I don't anticipate any
8 substantive change obviously in the way we do our work
9 and this, that and the other, so that's just a change.

10 But I would like to express our appreciation
11 on behalf of NANC to our colleagues in the TAPD for
12 all these many years of great support and help, so,
13 Cheryl and Marilyn, et cetera, thank you.

14 News item. There was a commission order
15 that was put out February 24 on the waivers that some
16 of the states had sought for a thousand block number
17 pooling I guess it is, and we'll have some discussion
18 on that. One thing I wanted to bring to your
19 attention is that there is a fifth further notice of
20 proposed rulemaking in that document starting at
21 paragraph 16, so some of you might want to be -- if
22 you weren't aware of that, should be, and I believe
23 that's all of my --

24 FEMALE VOICE: Okay.

25 MR. ATKINSON: Then we shall. Okay. We

1 have a guest. Commissioner Deborah Tate who is just
2 the newest FCC Commissioner and who had previously
3 been with the Tennessee Public Service Commission just
4 wanted to come down and visit NANC. Commissioner
5 Tate, it's good to see you.

6 MS. TATE: Thank you. Thank you all for
7 having me. I know most of you, but for those that I
8 haven't had the opportunity to meet, I'm Debbie Tate,
9 and I'm so thrilled to be here, and I really just
10 stopped by to thank you all.

11 I think that I've kind of worked on the
12 state end regarding number conservation, and I think
13 that Tennessee probably is a state that's done a
14 fairly good job with that. But I just wanted to thank
15 you all because I think it's so important for those of
16 you all who take the time and effort to participate no
17 matter whether you're from industry or from the state
18 side or from government in advising the commission.

19 And of course I'm fortunate because I came
20 from this state, so I've had an opportunity to work on
21 some of these issues before. I'm leaving some of my
22 cards. Obviously, you all know where to find me, but
23 anyway I did just want to again say thank you. Curt,
24 you're here so much, you might have to just get an
25 office upstairs, but thank you for your service. I

1 know how much time and effort it takes.

2 As my husband said, when are you ever going
3 to get a job that I don't have to keep paying for you
4 to fly back and forth to places. But anyway it's
5 great to be with you all, and I will just look forward
6 to seeing you all when you're here, and when you are
7 here, please come up. I'd like to have you all come
8 up to the office and just hear what's going on in your
9 states and kind of keep in touch with you all.

10 I made the mistake at the TRA of saying my
11 door was open, and the first Friday night I was there
12 until 9:30 listening to marital problems. So I've
13 given up my therapist role, but I do want you all to
14 know that I welcome you're input, and again thanks so
15 much for doing this.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. ATKINSON: Thank you for coming by.
18 It's great seeing you.

19 MS. TATE: Sure.

20 MR. ATKINSON: That was an announcement, so
21 we're perfect timing on the agenda. I've finished my
22 announcements. Anybody else have anything? Great, so
23 we can now move to Agenda Item 2 which is approval of
24 the minutes. We have two sets of minutes, and so,
25 let's see, the minutes of November 30. That will be

1 Document No. 2, and the minutes of January 24 will be
2 Document No. 3, and do we have any additions,
3 corrections, changes, et cetera? Did everybody read
4 them? No. Come on.

5 MR. GOLDBERG: I did.

6 MR. ATKINSON: I did, too. Jack and I. I
7 see some nodding heads. Well, subject to any
8 objections by the end of the meeting, I propose that
9 we adopt the minutes as drafted, and unless we hear
10 some major objections, we won't reopen that, but I'll
11 leave it for the potential reopening. Any objections?
12 Consider these adopted, but let me know if you have
13 any issues. Of course, then you'd have to admit that
14 you hadn't read them before.

15 First report of today's session will be the
16 report of the North American Numbering Plan
17 Administrator, John Manning, and I sent out an email
18 indicating that Don Gray from Nebraska would also have
19 an item to discuss during this agenda item, so let's
20 see. John's report will be Document No. 4, and Don
21 Gray's will be Document No. 5. John.

22 MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. My
23 report is the typical report you're used to seeing,
24 however I have added a couple of items that I'll
25 report on every other meeting or so. I've got a

1 report looking at statistics with regard to some of
2 the other numbering resources that NANPA administers,
3 carrier identification codes, 500, 900 NXXs. My
4 report provides a brief summary on the status of those
5 particular resources.

6 I've also included a document that I'm not
7 going to go over, but it's entitled 2005 NANPA
8 highlights. This is a document that summarizes NANPA
9 activities for 2005. It's a document that gives you
10 the accomplishments, highlights, et cetera, that NANPA
11 experienced during the year. It will be provided to
12 the Numbering Oversight Working Group tomorrow, and it
13 serves as an outline of the presentation material that
14 we'll be covering with them over the next day and a
15 half.

16 Again, I won't go through that in detail,
17 but if you have any questions on that particular
18 document, either ask them now or come up and see me in
19 a little bit. I'll be happy to answer them for you.

20 Turning to this page 2 central office code
21 assignment report. I give you February '06 where you
22 see 304 codes assigned and 67 returns. And on page 4
23 I give you a summary of where we are the first two
24 months of this year.

25 There were seven hundred and forty-two

1 assignments in January and February of this year.
2 That compares to 639 assignments in the same timeframe
3 in 2005, so you can see we're slightly up from where
4 we started from in 2005. The quantity of returns
5 we've experienced in the first two months of this year
6 are similar to what we had in 2005 for the same time
7 period.

8 A couple items I want to make note of with
9 regard to central office codes. There was an
10 announcement made back in December 2005 in which the
11 Industry Numbering Committee made some changes to the
12 application form used for requesting central office
13 codes. What we are doing is trying to get the
14 industry to start using the up-to-date form.

15 As such, we've sent notice to the industry,
16 we've sent out a couple of notices already that
17 beginning April 1, 2006, any paper application that is
18 submitted either directly to NANPA or most likely
19 through the pooling administrator for a central office
20 code, you have to use the December 9, 2005, version of
21 that form. If you do not use that form after that
22 date, your application will be denied.

23 Also, another item I wanted to make note of.
24 In February, due to some actions and discussions at
25 the Industry Numbering Committee, NANPA made a change

1 to the NANP Administration System relative to how we
2 deal with rate center consolidations and splits.

3 Previously, when there was a rate center
4 consolidation, all those carriers impacted, that is
5 those carriers that had central office codes in those
6 rate centers had to submit to NANPA Part 1 changing
7 the rate center from the old rate center to whatever
8 the new consolidated or split-rate centers would be.
9 This process unfortunately didn't work as well we
10 would like. NANPA simply didn't receive the Part 1s
11 or there were other issues that got in the way of
12 keeping the code assignment records up to date.

13 Beginning in February NANPA modified the
14 NANP Administration System such that when there is a
15 rate center consolidation, or when there is a rate
16 center split, NANPA will initiate the appropriate
17 changes within the system so that the NPA NXXs
18 associated with either the old rate centers or the old
19 rate centers become associated with the new rate
20 centers. So carriers no longer have to submit a Part
21 1 to NANPA to effect that change.

22 What we do is we provide notice to the
23 industry there's a rate center change, and on the
24 effective date of that change, NANPA will make the
25 appropriate changes in the CO code assignment records.

1 So I wanted to make sure that NANC was aware of how
2 that process was changing and how NANPA was assuming
3 the responsibility to make sure those records remain
4 up to date. Any questions on central office code
5 assignments?

6 Turning to NPA relief planning, attached to
7 my report is the report that shows area codes that are
8 exhausting in the next 36 months. You'll notice that
9 report has expanded a little bit. As we turn into the
10 new year, we have a few more area codes that have been
11 now coming up on the radar screen that are within the
12 next three-year NPA relief timeframe.

13 Of course, this is all subject to change as
14 we go through the next NRUF cycle and come up with new
15 NPA exhaust projections. I wanted to make note that
16 we have seen a number of area codes now come up on the
17 radar as it relates to the exhaust within 36 months.

18 For those that we're looking at in the 12
19 months, this list really hasn't changed. We've got
20 area code 310 which I think we're all very familiar
21 with. Efforts are underway now in that particular
22 area code, and we are now assigning central office
23 codes out of the new 424 overlay NPA of 310. The
24 effective date of those codes is not until late August
25 of this year.

1 With regard to Georgia 706, that plan is
2 underway. The overlay will be coming into existence
3 later on this year, and we have two area codes in
4 Illinois, 630 and 815, that we're watching very
5 closely. In particular, area code 815 which has a
6 trigger in place that when it reaches a set quantity
7 of available central office codes, we will begin the
8 process of implementing the overlay NPA. We're
9 getting very close to that trigger now, and the
10 industry is already addressing that very issue.

11 We have two new relief projects that we've
12 started this quarter, both of them here in the month
13 of March. New Mexico 505 which we've just recently
14 had a meeting on where we're looking at relief for
15 that particular NPA, and we've already initiated some
16 work in Indiana 812. Later this month we will have a
17 relief planning meeting where we'll look at various
18 split and overlay options and see what the industry
19 wants to recommend.

20 So all of last year we had very few relief
21 projects that we started. Beginning in 2006 we've
22 already got two on our plate. The NPA and NANP
23 exhaust projections, which I mentioned earlier, we're
24 putting together as we speak. They will be available
25 at the end of April.

1 As done previously, the NANC will be sent a
2 notice when those projections are available on our
3 website, and you can certainly -- the states in fact
4 will be given some type of heads up before they're
5 posted so they have an idea where things are standing.

6 One final note on this page, we're currently
7 working on the 2005 NANPA Annual Report, which will be
8 available at the end of this month. We will post that
9 to the NANPA website. It will be available in PDF
10 copy only. Again, a notice will go out to the NANC as
11 well as to the industry when that document is
12 available and posted on the website. Any questions
13 concerning area code relief planning?

14 Let me briefly cover some of the other
15 resources that NANPA is responsible for. First, we'll
16 talk carrier identification codes, and specifically
17 FGB carrier identification codes. If you want to make
18 this simple, just simply refer to the charts on each
19 of these pages, and it gives you a history year over
20 year of the number of assignments, number of reclaimed
21 codes and net yearly assignment information.

22 When you're looking at Feature Group B
23 codes, you can see in 2005 we assigned just two codes,
24 yet we reclaimed over 280 of those codes, so certainly
25 that particular resource is well in hand. In fact,

1 we're seeing that particular resource die off. It's
2 obvious by the assignments and the reclamation
3 process.

4 For Feature Group D codes, the chart is on
5 page 6. You can see we have signed 157 in 2005 and
6 how that compares to 2004 and 2003 roughly in the same
7 quantity of assignments. We continue to reclaim a
8 large of quantity of Feature Goup D CICs so therefore
9 we have a net negative yearly assignment rate over the
10 past two years, but that resource continues to be
11 used.

12 For 500 NXXs in 2005, we did assign 34 of
13 these codes, and got seven back. Over the past three
14 years that's our largest quantity on a per year basis
15 that we assigned of this particular resource. If we
16 maintain this assignment rate, we will roughly be in
17 the neighborhood of seven to eight years before the
18 500 resource exhausts.

19 Of course, that doesn't factor in the
20 quantity of reclamations that could potentially be
21 made, but exhaust of this particular resource is on
22 the horizon. Although not immediately, it's something
23 we need to continue to monitor. For the 900 area
24 code, five NXXs were assigned in 2005. We had 12 NXXs
25 returned. This particular area code and its use is

1 not anything that is growing real rapidly, and
2 therefore we don't anticipate this resource to exhaust
3 any time soon.

4 And, finally on page 7, the 555 line
5 numbers. We only assigned one of these numbers in
6 2005, and that's one over the past two years. Right
7 now there is no reclamation under way with regard to
8 the 555 resource. There's plenty of this resource
9 available, but we're certainly not making a lot of
10 assignments of 555 lines. Any questions on the other
11 resources part of my report?

12 Before we get into the issue that Don wanted
13 to raise, again page 8, 9 and 10 and so forth are our
14 highlights document. I encourage you to at least
15 glance through that and get a sense of what went on
16 during the year. The remaining pages are the matrix
17 of area codes exhausting in 36 months. That matrix
18 typically appends the NANPA report. Jerome, question?

19 MR. CANDELARIA: On page 8.

20 MR. MANNING: I'm sorry, Jerome. What page?

21 MR. CANDELARIA: Page 8. Can you elaborate
22 just a bit under response to regulatory activities
23 implemented the FCC SBCIS waiver, and my question is
24 what did this involve for you generally?

25 MR. MANNING: Well, if you recall the SBCIS

1 waiver allowed SBCIS to get resources directly from
2 the NANPA and the pool administrator. The process
3 that was established however was since there was no
4 certification provided by the state in lieu of that,
5 the primary process put in place was a 30-day window
6 in which an application that was made to the
7 administrator whether it's to NANPA or to the PA,
8 SBCIS had to provide at least 30 days' notice to the
9 state.

10 And I believe it's also to the FCC, and in
11 that process when we got that application, we had to
12 ensure that those particular items were put into place
13 before such an assignment was made. Now, from our
14 perspective, we had some initial activity with regard
15 to this matter, but primarily they've had to deal with
16 it really on the pooling side because I think the
17 majority of resources had been in the pooling rate
18 centers.

19 MR. CANDELARIA: This didn't involve any
20 extraordinary costs?

21 MR. MANNING: No. We were able to handle
22 this particular instance because we were only dealing
23 with one company. We were able to work through the
24 process to make that happen. Certainly, if that type
25 of mechanism was put in place for a large number of

1 carriers, then that would be a significant change in
2 our process.

3 MR. CANDELARIA: But didn't the FCC say that
4 similarly situated organizations could follow the same
5 process?

6 MR. MANNING: No. No. At this time, it's
7 only SBCIS that has this waiver in place.

8 MALE VOICE: Well, my understanding was the
9 FCC did extend the opportunity to other providers to
10 take advantage of the same proposal, although I don't
11 believe the FCC is active on this (inaudible).

12 FEMALE VOICE: Yes. That would be if they
13 petition it as SBCIS did, then we would respond to
14 their petitioners, but there has to be a petition on
15 file and a response.

16 MALE VOICE: No petitioner. I guess I heard
17 something.

18 FEMALE VOICE: Right. No FCC response yet.
19 Those are pending petitions. Yes.

20 MR. MANNING: My point is that there is no
21 other carrier that I am aware of.

22 FEMALE VOICE: Right.

23 MR. ATKINSON: And he's confirming for me
24 that he currently has this process in place.

25 FEMALE VOICE: That's correct.

1 MR. ATKINSON: Any other questions or
2 clarifications? All right.

3 MR. MANNING: Don wanted to raise his item
4 now while I was here.

5 MR. ATKINSON: Yes. Don, go ahead.

6 MR. GRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Don
7 Gray, Nebraska. First, thank you very much for
8 allowing us this opportunity to bring this up for
9 discussion here, and I would also on behalf of my
10 commission thank the FCC for the grant of the petition
11 that we received two weeks ago.

12 My commission believes that's a very
13 important tool for us to be able to extend the life of
14 the 402 area code, and I hope in a couple of hours I
15 can give you an official announcement of what we are
16 doing and will be doing in the future. As with many
17 tools you get, the devil is in the details and the
18 implementation.

19 And as we begin to look at how are we going
20 to use this new tool and look at how it would most
21 likely be implemented, it seems that the TBPAG
22 provided the necessary guidance for how carriers would
23 report at the thousands-block level going into the
24 establishment of pooling in a rate center, but then
25 once you had pooling, then the question came how are

1 they going to report since many of our carriers are
2 rural carriers, and we found two conflicting areas.

3 One was in the INC guidelines for the NRUF,
4 and the other was in the Form 502, the actual NRUF
5 reporting, and in talking both with members of INC and
6 John Manning and his folks, it seems that the intent
7 is fairly clear, and that for the process to properly
8 work any carrier, regardless of their status that's in
9 a pooling environment, needs to report at the
10 thousands-block level, but if you start reading each
11 line, each section of the INC and the 502 guidelines,
12 you find some places where there's an oops.

13 And so that's what I wanted to bring to
14 floor here so that perhaps we can have a discussion or
15 at least get some input and guidance from you folks as
16 to should the intent be that all carriers
17 participating in thousands-block number pooling
18 regardless of their status report at the thousands-
19 block level.

20 MR. ATKINSON: Let's have some discussion.
21 Rosemary?.

22 MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint
23 Nextel. Were you looking to put this revised language
24 like in the INC, or were you looking to start a best
25 practice matrix of sorts, or I guess other than the

1 discussion, what is the end result that you are
2 looking for?

3 MR. GRAY: The end result is not necessarily
4 am I going to suggest here today that we ought to do
5 this or that, but that it appears that it should be
6 reporting at the thousands-block in a pooling rate
7 center for everybody. Now, I think I would be
8 comfortable with if this group says yes, that should
9 be the intent, and INC, NANP, whoever, go forth and
10 look very closely at the wording and clean any up that
11 needs to be cleaned up. That would be sufficient for
12 me coming out of here today, Rosemary.

13 Because I think the other thing is you start
14 looking at some of these, and it was interesting. A
15 couple of folks referenced me back to the 2000 FCC
16 order that originally starting the thousands-block
17 pooling, and in there it very, very clearly drew a
18 bright line and said if you don't have to port
19 numbers, you don't have to participate in this even in
20 reporting which is obviously much different than six
21 years later.

22 And the most recent order where there was a
23 distinction made that it's not the capability that's
24 the distinction, it's whether you will have to offer
25 porting or not, so I think maybe that's where some of

1 our language differences have come up.

2 MS. EMMER: Okay. Thank you. Sprint Nextel
3 wholeheartedly supports the effort.

4 MR. GRAY: Thank you. John?

5 MR. MCHUGH: We agree, OPASTCO agrees.
6 We'll support on the suggestion that rural companies
7 participating in pooling have to report at the
8 thousands-block level.

9 MR. GRAY: And have you advised your members
10 of this, or will you?

11 MR. MCHUGH: Absolutely.

12 MR. GRAY: Thank you.

13 MR. ATKINSON: I think what I'm hearing is
14 we have a consensus. I mean, is there anybody who
15 thinks that that's not a good idea? It seems kind of
16 natural, and just kind of goes along with the intent
17 is my thought, and certainly if OPASTCO has no
18 problems -- they're the ones who are burdened
19 particularly or would be participating, so my view
20 would be there's a clear NANC unanimity if not
21 consensus.

22 Certainly, consensus that Don's proposal is
23 reasonable, and I see someone from INC taking the
24 public microphone because INC will probably need to
25 just make any clarifications.

1 MR. HAVENS: Ken Havens. I just wanted to
2 offer on behalf of the INC to bring in an issue to the
3 INC, and the INC can initiate an issue and address
4 this particular request. In fact, we can do that next
5 week which is when we meet.

6 MR. ATKINSON: Okay. So let me just make
7 that an action assignment that you'll just look at
8 that and report back at the next session presumably,
9 or you'll keep us advised of any language correction
10 in the guidelines, and I'll assume that that will
11 satisfy everybody.

12 MR. HAVENS: Thank you.

13 MR. GRAY: Thank you.

14 MR. ATKINSON: Are there any other questions
15 either for John Manning or for Don? Then that agenda
16 item is done. Thank you, John.

17 MR. MANNING: Thank you.

18 MR. ATKINSON: Next item on our agenda
19 report of national thousands-block pooling
20 administrator, Amy Putnam. Amy's report will be
21 Document No. 6. Pooling is fine, right, Amy?

22 MS. PUTNAM: Pooling is fine. Busy, but
23 fine. Okay. If you look at the first slide, page 2
24 of the report, the PA activity summary data. You see
25 that our last two months have been extremely busy and

1 have been our first and second highest months ever.
2 The third was March 2005 which will be falling off the
3 rolling 12-month report next time. We normally file
4 our FCC reports on the 15th for the previous month,
5 but we filed early this month so that we could do the
6 February reporting.

7 With respect to the next slide, the summary
8 activity, there again is March 2005 through February
9 2006. Page 4, CO codes opened, again a rolling 12-
10 month inventory, and the rate centers changed from M
11 to M, that's 150 in the last 12 months. Those are
12 where new service providers moved into rate centers
13 that previously had a single-service provider in them,
14 and when that happens, we contact the carrier that is
15 operating in that rate center and let it know. Yes,
16 Rosemary?

17 MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint
18 Nextel (inaudible).

19 MS. PUTNAM: Okay. I'm sorry.

20 MS. EMMER: No. That's okay. For the
21 blocks assigned in the PAS manual Part 3 with January
22 with the increase being so dramatic or drastic.

23 MS. PUTNAM: Yes.

24 MS. EMMER: Was there any particular reason
25 that you guys are aware of that it was -- that's

1 significantly higher.

2 MS. PUTNAM: Yes, it was significant, and
3 there is a carrier, and the information is in the
4 public sector because there have been press releases,
5 but there is a carrier that's going out across the
6 country establishing footprint and is getting blocks
7 across the country.

8 MS. EMMER: Thank you.

9 MR. ATKINSON: I had related thoughts, so
10 I'll just interject it now. I mean, in a sense we
11 would see any sort of stresses, incipient stresses and
12 strains on numbering resources first in your pooling
13 before we see --

14 MS. PUTNAM: We are the gatekeeper.

15 MR. ATKINSON: Before we see them at the
16 NANPA, right? So I just think this 12-month forecast
17 it might be useful actually at some point periodically
18 even to put this into a graph stretching somewhat even
19 back the past four months just to give sort of a early
20 warning because there's a lot of assumptions that go
21 into the NANPA forecast, and right now we're pretty
22 relaxed about it.

23 It's like 2030 something, but if we start
24 seeing a dramatic up-tick like this, and it persists,
25 that might start rippling through up to the area code

1 level and things like that, so it's a useful early
2 warning sign, this chart is.

3 MS. PUTNAM: Yes, and the information about
4 pooling activity over the past year and over the past
5 five years, and since pooling began with the state
6 trials, that graph is in our annual report which is
7 posted on our website from last year and will be
8 posted again this year.

9 MR. ATKINSON: I will go to your website.

10 MS. PUTNAM: And if you like once we post
11 this year's annual report, we can simply put that
12 graph in the next NANC report.

13 MR. ATKINSON: Yes, that will be helpful.
14 Thank you.

15 MS. PUTNAM: Okay.

16 MS. EMMER: I have one more question. On
17 the same slide under denials with the red light rule,
18 61 in December. That seems pretty high compared to
19 the other months. Was there anything you can share
20 with us about that?

21 MS. PUTNAM: Honestly, Rosemary, I brought
22 that information to the January meeting, and I don't
23 remember.

24 MS. EMMER: Okay. Thanks.

25 MS. PUTNAM: But I can check on it and let

1 you know.

2 MS. EMMER: No. That's okay.

3 MS. PUTNAM: Okay. I believe if nobody has
4 any other questions we were moving on to page 5 which
5 is the status of the change orders. We still have
6 four pending change orders. The NPAC, the one-time
7 scrub is in its third iteration. If you recall that
8 particular one goes back to May of 2005, but earlier
9 ones went back well into 2004.

10 We initially requested a report either
11 daily, weekly or monthly then that change order was
12 disapproved, and it was proposed that we do a one-time
13 scrub of one NPA per impact region to see if a scrub
14 would be valuable, and that information that we
15 gleaned from that scrub was deemed to be valuable to
16 carriers, and the NOWG recommended that we submit a
17 change order requesting a one-time scrub, and that's
18 the one that's out there.

19 Change Orders 43 and 44 relate to changes in
20 the guidelines, and Change Order 45 as indicated
21 related to user suggestions from the 2004 NOWG survey
22 which we received last summer. Next slide shows our
23 instances of unscheduled unavailability from March of
24 '05 to the end of February of '06, and we had 19
25 minutes.

1 Next slide, other PA activities. Continue
2 to participate in meetings on the pANI ESQK
3 administration. With respect to the NOWG, we are now
4 undertaking the regular monthly review meeting with
5 the NOWG and had our first two meetings January 27 and
6 February 3, and have worked out a schedule for the
7 rest of the year.

8 With respect to the NOWG survey, we are
9 trying to drum up business in the response category,
10 so we have sent a number of notices regarding the
11 survey that the timeline for responding was extended,
12 and we're looking forward to our operational review in
13 Concord, California, at our office out there on April
14 4 and 5.

15 With respect to the delegated authority
16 petitions as was previously mentioned, there were
17 approvals for five states and eight NPAs and
18 immediately following the issuance of that order we've
19 held conference calls with regulatory staff of all the
20 states that were involved. And we are anticipating
21 that there will be state orders issues and that we
22 will schedule supplemental implementation meetings
23 based on the content of those state orders.

24 Obviously, our conduct will be governed by
25 the content of the state orders to the extent that

1 they do not in any way conflict with existing FCC
2 orders, and our annual report. A draft has been
3 provided to the NOWG for review, and we are on target
4 for filing that on March 31 with the FCC and
5 subsequent to that it will be posted to the website,
6 and we will provide a copy of the graph of pooling
7 activities to the NANC at the next meeting.

8 We also have a highlight section of our
9 annual report which we will review in some detail with
10 the NOWG during our review, April 4 and 5, but for
11 today I wanted to just kind of highlight some of the
12 things that we look at that we did during the year.
13 We processed 102,304 applications which is an increase
14 of 47.8 percent over 2004. In 2004 we processed
15 69,193. We also assigned 55,990 blocks which is a
16 49.6 percent increase over 2004.

17 Our total approved blocks is 45.4 percent
18 increase over 2004. In 2004, we approved 60,206
19 blocks, and in 2005 we approved 87,571. For 2005, we
20 had an increase of 10.7 percent in central office
21 codes that were open. We went up from 2,153 to 2,385,
22 and we reclaimed 78 blocks in 2005 which is a 136-
23 percent increase over 2004, so our pooling
24 administrative services center was mighty busy this
25 year.

1 We also as you can see worked on our
2 website. We improved our website this year, and we
3 got lots of positive comments on the new website. We
4 submitted eight change orders and implemented nine
5 that were approved.

6 We successfully conducted our disaster
7 recovery business continuity plan testing, and we
8 upgraded the system and database and applications on
9 August 21. If you went back to the system instances
10 of unavailability, there was one that was an asterisk
11 there where the system was unavailable during August,
12 but that was scheduled for the upgrade, so that did
13 not count against our unavailability requirement.

14 And the pooling implementation management
15 continues. The quality control and maintenance of the
16 rate center files. That means whenever a rate center
17 goes from M to M contacting the carriers, making sure
18 that it's reflected on the website whenever OMB issues
19 a bulletin that affects anything having to do with
20 MSAs.

21 We review the website and make sure that any
22 changes needed to rate centers are made. If states
23 request changes for example from excluded to optional,
24 or service providers request changes from excluded to
25 optional, all of those things are part of the

1 maintenance of the rate center files.

2 We produced 2,572 reports this year for the
3 FCC, for state regulators, for the NANC, the NANPA and
4 service providers, and we worked with states in a
5 variety of ways. We did a refresher for state
6 commission staff for PAS use. We had an informational
7 conference call.

8 We went to states that requested in-person
9 pooling education meetings and responded to a variety
10 of inquiries on issues related to pooling from states,
11 from service providers, and from the FCC. We were
12 busy. We're not sitting around eating bonbons. Thank
13 you. Questions?

14 MR. ATKINSON: John first, then Rosemary.

15 MR. CANDELARIA: John Candelaria, NPTA.
16 Does pooling administration separately track rate
17 centers where there's no blocks available for
18 assignment?

19 MS. PUTNAM: We don't track that. We can
20 review that information. We can query the database
21 and find out whether or not a rate center has numbers
22 available. Most frequently if you look at that
23 information, you find that it's situations where
24 carriers have forecast for numbers, but when we go and
25 try to replenish the pool, nobody meets months to

1 exhaust or utilization, and we can't find a carrier
2 that will come in and enable us to open a code for
3 pool replenishment.

4 MR. CANDELARIA: I'm just trying to get a
5 sense of why red this is. Let me cut to the chase --

6 MS. PUTNAM: I think it's because carriers
7 forecast with a sense of optimism.

8 MR. CANDELARIA: Okay. The basis for my
9 question is our favorite area code 310 where we have
10 rate centers where there are not blocks available. My
11 concern is new entrants cannot enter a market when
12 there are no blocks available. At least entry is
13 highly problematic, so I'm just trying to get a sense
14 whether this is an isolated 310 issue, or whether
15 there are other rate centers out there where
16 competitor should kind of look elsewhere?

17 MS. PUTNAM: There are two situations where
18 there are rate centers where it looks as if there are
19 not numbers available. One is 310, the other is where
20 we cannot replenish the pool because we can't find
21 somebody to do it. In 310 there are only 100 blocks
22 left. I pulled out my little 310 piece of paper as
23 soon as you raised your hand. I thought he's going to
24 say -- I wanted to beat Anna who probably was on the
25 website this morning checking it out.

1 In 310 there are only 100 blocks left, and
2 we do have rate centers that we have no resources
3 left. We can only do what regulators permit us to do,
4 and if there aren't any blocks left because of delayed
5 area relief, there we are.

6 MR. ATKINSON: Anna?

7 MS. MILLER: Anna Miller at T-Mobile. Yes,
8 310 is the exception, and there's no more NXXs
9 available to replenish the rate centers in 310 right
10 now that do not have blocks available for assignment,
11 but just to elaborate on what Amy was saying, there
12 are situations where there's rate centers with zero
13 blocks available for assignment, but if nobody is
14 applying for any numbers in that rate center, then
15 there's not an opportunity to assign an NXX I guess to
16 that rate center and identify LERG assignee.

17 So I guess a couple of things need to happen
18 to replenish a pool. There needs to be demand, and
19 then if there is no NXX, if there are no blocks
20 available, and you have to open up a new NXX, you have
21 to have LERG assignee to take responsibility as the CO
22 holder for that block, so just to clarify on that.

23 MS. PUTNAM: That's correct.

24 MS. MILLER: And then I think the other
25 comment I'd like to make with regard to forecasting

1 optimism, and that is I think that that is a
2 possibility. One of the challenges that we face with
3 our current system is that in your forecast you need
4 to have the forecast in the right month.

5 So if for example T-Mobile said that we
6 needed four blocks in March, and two blocks in April,
7 and we only qualify and applied for three blocks in
8 March, and then we needed three blocks in April, and
9 we could only get two because we said we'd only have
10 two.

11 We'd have to update our forecast, so I think
12 it's challenging to get it exactly right in the right
13 month, and I think to accommodate that, you try to
14 spread it out so that you don't run drawing up short
15 in one month if demand is a week later than you
16 thought it was, so that's a challenge I think in the
17 forecasting.

18 MS. PUTNAM: Yes. We look ahead, and we
19 attempt to replenish when the forecasts reflect a need
20 to replenish. Another challenge that we have is
21 carriers that forecast zero and come in and suddenly
22 need resources and change their forecast in order to
23 get resources, and they drain the pool at that point,
24 and of course then we can go out and we can again
25 attempt to replenish.

1 But for us to replenish a pool, we need
2 somebody who meets months to exhaust in utilization
3 who can perform the functions of the LERG assignee.
4 We do two things. We not only canvas carriers to
5 become a LERG assignee, but we also contact carriers
6 that are operating in any rate center and ask them if
7 they have blocks to donate if we need resources in a
8 rate center so that we don't have to open codes if
9 carriers do in fact have blocks to donate.

10 MR. ATKINSON: Rosemary?

11 MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel.
12 Two things. The first thing is I didn't see in the
13 notes from January about 61, so I want to get with you
14 on that.

15 MS. PUTNAM: Okay.

16 MS. EMMER: Ten miles for the red light
17 rule, and regarding the forecasting optimism comments,
18 it's my understanding that the PA is subjectively
19 determining based on what the carriers' forecasts are
20 as to how many numbers are going to be in the pool
21 also. So I mean we might forecast high, but if we
22 only use let's say 25 percent of actuals, there is
23 somewhat of a subjective decision made somewhere along
24 the line.

25 And while I think generally speaking the

1 pools are plentiful, there have been several times
2 where Spring, or at least Legacy Nextel has needed a
3 number whether it be something we've forecasted for or
4 whether it be whether we didn't forecast, but we
5 needed an initial code somewhere where we have had to
6 wait, and so you're right.

7 At times, we might not be able to meet
8 utilization and need 100,000 numbers, but that is in
9 fact something that happens that really, truly across
10 the board isn't very fair, especially when we might
11 have forecasted for those numbers, but because there's
12 this subjective nature in some way to this whole
13 process that we might not be able to get those codes.

14 MS. PUTNAM: Rosemary, I'd really appreciate
15 it if you would bring those to our attention because
16 we have not had a complaint in years about carriers
17 not being able to get numbers except in California.

18 MS. EMMER: Right. This came out during our
19 internal Legacy Nextel survey process, so when we
20 finish that --

21 MS. PUTNAM: Then it's something that
22 someone is not advising us about.

23 MS. EMMER: And we brought the concept of
24 forecasting up on the last NOWG call so that we can
25 make sure to start figuring this out for the long term

1 as to how we can best do this maybe a little more
2 objectively going forward.

3 MS. PUTNAM: Because our system is set up to
4 just generate information about pool replenishment.
5 You need to replenish this rate center as the
6 forecasts reflect, so if that is a problem, it's a
7 problem that has not been brought to our attention,
8 and it would be great if you could give me some
9 examples.

10 MS. EMMER: Right. We are actually on our
11 caravan in this morning from Sterling, this was one of
12 our topics of conversation that we had with several
13 carriers, and definitely as we move forward having our
14 communications or calls every month, we'll definitely
15 work through this so that it works out best for
16 everyone. And like I said before, as a general rule
17 or typically if you will there's been plenty of
18 numbers in the pool, but we're noticing now that --

19 MS. PUTNAM: Yes. Since every carrier is
20 supposed to keep its own six-month inventory, you
21 would think that that would not be a problem with its
22 six-month inventory and our attempt to keep a six-
23 month inventory, you would think that that would never
24 occur except in California.

25 MS. EMMER: Well, you're right. You would

1 think that wouldn't occur, but with big marketing
2 programs and things, sometimes it is impossible to
3 keep that number. The same with you guys. It's a
4 situation that we're hoping to work through this year.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. ATKINSON: Just from what I gathered
7 from this discussion there's a problem in 310. There
8 is managing issues elsewhere, so there's no other
9 customer visible concerns, but I'm also hearing
10 there's some strange incentives built into the system
11 to overforecast, to not want to take responsibility
12 for a new code and things like that.

13 The NOWG in its work kind of listening to
14 these things in terms of if there is a real problem,
15 the NOWG would take the initiative to propose any
16 changes in process, procedures, et cetera along with
17 the PA, right?

18 MS. EMMER: That's correct, and how we've
19 begun that process now from the NOWG perspective is
20 during our monthly call with the PA, we brought this
21 up as an information topic, and we had a discussion as
22 to what they could possibly provide to us so that we
23 can start understanding a little better I think really
24 each other in this regard.

25 But specifically what we could understand

1 from the PA, so they're going to report back to us at
2 the next month a snapshot in a day if you will of the
3 rate center, so we've begun that just recently.

4 MR. ATKINSON: Right. How long have we been
5 doing pooling? Two years?

6 MS. PUTNAM: Well, we've been doing national
7 pooling -- the contract was awarded in June 2001, but
8 we rolled out in March of 2002.

9 MR. ATKINSON: So the rules, the
10 regulations, the process is always being looked at for
11 fine-tuning? Good. Christine?

12 MS. KELLY: Chris Kelly, New York. I just
13 wanted to offer a contrasting view of that
14 subjectivity. New York filed comments on the PA
15 requirements document, an advocate for that
16 subjectivity so to speak. I don't know if that's the
17 right word which is used by the PA as it mitigates the
18 optimism. We really do think the PA's expertise in
19 looking at the actual use in a rate center is a very
20 useful tool in not stranding resources, so I just
21 wanted to offer a contrasting view.

22 MR. ATKINSON: Any other comments? Thank
23 you very much.

24 MS. PUTNAM: Thank you.

25 MR. ATKINSON: Agenda Item No. 5, the report

1 of the North American Numbering Portability Management
2 LLC.

3 FEMALE VOICE: Document 7?

4 MALE VOICE: You're off by two.

5 MR. ATKINSON: We're doing Agenda Item 5,
6 right?

7 FEMALE VOICE: I'm sorry.

8 MR. ATKINSON: Agenda Item 5, and the NANPM
9 report will be Document No. 7.

10 MR. CLAY: Good morning, NANC. I have two
11 items to report this morning. The first item deals
12 with the completion of Statement of Work 51. NANC
13 Change Order 393 which is a part of software Release
14 3.3 required changes be made to the NPAC's performance
15 requirements based on porting and pooling volume
16 forecasting.

17 SOW or Statement of Work 51 was prepared by
18 NeuStar and presented to the NANPM for approval, and
19 as of the last meeting that we had, we approved the
20 Statement of Work 51, and Statement of Work 51 will
21 document those changes to our master agreement. As of
22 this morning, I understand that there may be some
23 issues that came out with this statement of work, and
24 we will be addressing that over the next couple of
25 days.

1 The second item that I'd like to report
2 would be that the INC made a request to the NANPM to
3 authorize an ad hoc report for the purpose of
4 identifying service providers with ported telephone
5 numbers within an NXX code when the code holder is to
6 change the rate center.

7 The code would cause problems if there are
8 ported numbers within the NXX, and this ad hoc report
9 would allow NANPA to eliminate those problems for our
10 customers. The NANPM LLC approved that at a previous
11 meeting, and hopefully that will solve their issues.
12 That's all I have today. Are there any questions?

13 MR. ATKINSON: No questions?

14 MR. CLAY: Thank you, chairman.

15 MR. ATKINSON: Yes? We do.

16 (Away from microphone.)

17 MALE VOICE: (Inaudible) California. I have
18 a question (inaudible).

19 MR. ATKINSON: Could you just raise your
20 hand so the guys back there can see where you are?

21 MALE VOICE: (Inaudible) exact appropriate
22 time for it, but we have had a situation where ex
23 parte has come in on everybody's favorite 310 issue
24 and asked some questions about specifically local
25 number portability applications or use of LNP's

1 specifically from ILECs to their wireless affiliate
2 for transfer of specific numbers in areas where
3 thousands-block pools are not available. And this is
4 the first I'd heard of anything of this nature, and
5 unique to California I'm sure in our 310.

6 But I have no idea if anybody else is aware
7 of this, or if anybody could speak to this issue. We
8 haven't done any data requests or anything along that
9 line, but we do have some concerns if we do find
10 information about portability being used effectively
11 in a potentially discriminatory manner for the
12 affiliates of carriers with large number resources and
13 contaminated blocks.

14 MR. CLAY: This is the first that I've heard
15 of this also. There are several members here from the
16 LNPA working group and from the NANPM LLC, so that's
17 something that we will have to discuss outside of this
18 meeting, but right now this is the first I've heard of
19 that issue.

20 MALE VOICE: Okay. Are you aware of
21 mechanisms by which a number could be ported without a
22 customer being assigned to it on one end or the other?

23 MR. CLAY: No.

24 MALE VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. CLAY: Okay.

1 MR. ATKINSON: Anything else? Thank you,
2 Mel.

3 MR. CLAY: Thank you.

4 MR. ATKINSON: All right. We're scheduled
5 for break at 10:45. I suggest we continue on until
6 10:45. I'm sure we can get the INC report and maybe
7 one other in, so the INC report from Ken Havens,
8 Agenda Item 6, Document No. 8.

9 MR. HAVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 Turning to Slide 2, you'll see a slide that provides
11 information on when the INC last met as well as
12 indicating that we will be meeting next week at the
13 ATIS annual meeting.

14 On Slide 3 it gives you an idea of some of
15 the work that's been going on in the LNPA subcommittee
16 within INC, and indicates that we had received
17 correspondence from the LNPA working group regarding
18 unusable blocks that sought modification to the
19 thousands-block donation form to help ensure that
20 donating service providers performed their
21 intraservice provider ports to avoid service
22 disruption when blocks are subsequently assigned.

23 The INC created Issue 506 to address this
24 concern, and the changes would have SPs complete an
25 updated Appendix 2 form as part of the donation

1 process, and this form would step service providers
2 through a series of questions regarding the status of
3 blocks being donated.

4 And this form in its updated form are to ask
5 questions of a service provider such as is the block
6 contaminated, and if yes, how many numbers are not
7 available for assignment, have all your ISPs been
8 completed, has the block been protected from further
9 assignment.

10 Further, the form or the changes goes on to
11 explain the benefits of performing intraservice
12 provider ports and protecting the block from further
13 assignment. And so the INC and the LNPA working group
14 believe that these changes will help to educate
15 service providers on the activities that must occur,
16 and why those activities occur, and subsequently will
17 serve to avoid service disruptions when those blocks
18 are subsequently donated.

19 On Slide 4, you'll recall that we had a
20 presentation here at the last NANC from a video relay
21 service providers. I think it was Mark Ersky from CSD
22 that presented that information to the NANC. He also
23 came at the INC and made a similar presentation to the
24 INC, so what has occurred, there was a general
25 exchange of information from Mark and a dialogue that

1 ensued between Mark and the INC,.

2 As well as I might point out that there were
3 other members from the VRS providers. I believe Mike
4 Maddox and Joe Romriel from Sorrensen Communications
5 were there to provide their input and perspectives,
6 and so as I indicated, the INC created an issue to
7 address this, and we will be working this issue next
8 week to further along that process. Any questions
9 thus far?

10 Okay. Turning to Slide 5, this slide
11 identifies issues that remain in initial pending at
12 the INC. Issue 407 which most of us are familiar
13 with, the treatment of dedicated codes for single
14 customers in a pooling environment.

15 Very briefly this is a process improvement
16 issue whereby if I'm a service provide that's
17 requesting a dedicated code for a customer in a pooled
18 environment, the process change essentially wants to
19 allow that service provider to go directly to the
20 NANPA to acquire that code. In today's process they
21 have to go first through the PA and then to NANPA to
22 get that code. Mr. Chairman, I believe you were going
23 to take a look a the letter that NANC sent to the FCC
24 last February.

25 MR. ATKINSON: I believe I did.

1 MR. HAVENS: Okay.

2 MR. ATKINSON: I did. 407.

3 MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir.

4 MR. ATKINSON: I have a recollection of
5 writing such a letter, but I will double-check that it
6 went out.

7 MR. HAVENS: Okay.

8 MR. ATKINSON: I will double check. I
9 always should do my own action assignments first, and
10 I looked through the list this morning and said yes I
11 did that, but I'll check right now. Thank you.

12 MR. HAVENS: Thank you. Issue 475 and 486
13 are two other items that remain in initial pending
14 that were briefly touched on by the PA as having
15 change orders associated with those, the first being
16 the thousands-block forecast report directions. In
17 this issue we essentially made changes to the T-bag
18 Appendix 1 document.

19 (Electronic interference.)

20 Essentially, we've modified the guidelines
21 to take out of reference to a field on the Appendix 1
22 form that wasn't really there, so we wanted to make
23 sure that the guidelines were copacetic with the
24 actual form itself. And secondly on Issue 486
25 contaminated or pristine assigned block returns,

1 the changes here would require block holders to notate
2 on the Part 1(a) form in a new field, a new field is
3 the remarks field whether or not the thousands-block
4 being donated is pristine or contaminated thus
5 providing the PA some additional information about the
6 block when they receive it back from the service
7 provider. Questions?

8 Slide 6 shows those issues that are in final
9 closure. We have six issues here. Issue 463, LERG
10 assignees for pool replenishment or LRN requests.
11 This issue received attention at the INC over the
12 course of several meetings, and its intent was to give
13 service providers in need of an LRN the ability to be
14 assigned an LRN and essentially protect the numbers
15 associated with that assignment from being used.

16 It was a forward-thinking type of issue with
17 regard to number conservation, and the INC as I
18 indicated talked about it over the course of a few
19 weeks. And ultimately they decided that the current
20 process whereby if a service provider needs a code for
21 LRN purposes but doesn't meet the MTE or utilization
22 criteria to go to the state regulator via the safety
23 belt process.

24 That's the current process for dealing with
25 situations like that and the INC came to conclude that

1 that was still the best process for this particular
2 type of concern and thus the issue was closed without
3 making any changes.

4 Issue 503, clarification on LERG assignment
5 block holder Part 4 submissions. Changes were made
6 here to the TBPAG to clarify which part form should be
7 used by a block holder who is also a LERG assignee of
8 an NXX. Essentially, we created within the guideline
9 changes a series of if statements. If this, then
10 please use the following process, and so that
11 essentially is what we did with that issue.

12 Issue 500, returning a nonpool dedicated
13 customer code. This was essentially an administrative
14 change. We had language in both the TBPAG and the
15 COCAG that provided instructions for a service
16 provider on how to return a nonpooled dedicated code.

17 The INC concluded that that same information needed
18 to be in another part of the COCAG guidelines, and
19 that would be COCAG Appendix C, and so we added that
20 to the document.

21 501, becoming a new LERG assignee due to
22 ported TNs. We made changes to the COCAG Appendix C
23 to address when a service provider becomes a new LERG
24 assignee for a pooled NXX as a result of having ported
25 TNs but doesn't have a block assigned from that NXX.

1 Issue 502, pooled NXX codes returned in
2 error. The COCAG was modified in this particular
3 instance to address the process that service providers
4 should follow when a pooled NXX is returned in error.

5 We identified essentially five scenarios that could
6 occur, and then we notated within the guideline
7 changes which particular process should be followed in
8 those particular circumstances.

9 And finally, issue 505, expedite request
10 clarification to the COCAG. There was some confusion
11 apparently with regard to the process that needed to
12 be followed when a service provider wanted to expedite
13 the request for a code, and so the INC clarified that
14 process, and we put that in the document. Any
15 questions thus far?

16 Moving on to the last page, this essentially
17 identifies the relevant pages for information that can
18 be found with respect to INC guidelines, issues,
19 things of that nature. One note that we'd like to
20 note for those NANC members that are new and frankly
21 for all NANC members for that matter the new NANC
22 operating manual that recently came out refers to the
23 process for NANC members to be able to acquire a
24 password for all INC documentation.

25 And if you needed information or wanted

1 information about INC, you could contact the INC
2 administrator who is now Jackie English. Charles Piot
3 is leaving the INC to move on to newer, greener
4 pastures, and so Jackie English would be the
5 individual that you would contact. Any questions?
6 Thank you for your time.

7 MR. ATKINSON: Just to report, I did prepare
8 the letter requested on 4-07, but I sent it into a
9 different pathway than normal to the FCC since it
10 deals with a long outstanding issue, and I don't know
11 that there's anybody from the commission here today
12 that was going to be able to respond to that, but I
13 will take an action assignment to followup on my
14 previous correspondent.

15 MR. HAVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 MR. ATKINSON: I would propose that we take
17 a 15-minute break. We're going to come back and
18 discuss money, the next two agenda items, and so in
19 fact why don't we reconvene at 11:00 promptly. Thank
20 you.

21 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

22 MR. ATKINSON: The next report will be
23 Document No. 9.

24 MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning. I'd like to
25 start with going over the fund's financial position at

1 the end of February. At the end of February the fund
2 has \$4.1 million mainly made up of cash that's left
3 from accrued liabilities of \$1.8 million, and the
4 makeup of the accrued liabilities is below there, and
5 during February, the fund that was invested earned
6 3.95 percent.

7 The next page, page 2, is the projection of
8 the fund, forecast of the fund for the next year. Of
9 particular note is the balance of the fund at the end
10 of June which is the funding year end. The \$2.2
11 million is what we project the fund will be at. We
12 wanted it to be at \$1 million which was the
13 contingency balance, but there is extra money going to
14 be left.

15 The makeup of that money can be seen on the
16 far right-hand bottom corner, the discrepancy or the
17 variance, and it's mainly made up to carrier audits
18 that were not done that we had anticipated being done.

19 The bulk of it is that number, \$560,000, is \$490,000.

20 If we go to the next page, page 3, it's a makeup of
21 the next six months what we expect to spend assuming
22 we get the bills and the approvals to spend the money.

23 That's what's anticipated.

24 That's the first part of the report. Are
25 there any questions on that?

1 MR. ATKINSON: Could NANC have a field trip
2 to Jamaica? Yes. We could visit with Courtney and
3 have a meeting down there and use up some of these
4 surplus funds. What do you think? Any other
5 constructive comments?

6 MS. MARCOTTE: Okay. The next part of the
7 report is the budget and the contribution factor.
8 Page 4 and 5 are the commentary on the budget, so if
9 we turn right to page 6 that is the budget, and I'll
10 go over that with you. The first part of the NANPA
11 administration, and that is a contract in place for
12 that amount for the \$1.4 million. We've taken out the
13 amount for the international participant, so that
14 brings it down to NANPA administration costs of
15 \$1,338,000.

16 The one thousands-block pooling there is no
17 contract. The current contract expires in June of
18 this year, so what we have done is without any other
19 information we have used the same amount of \$3.5
20 million as last for this year because we have no
21 information to suggest it would be any different.

22 We've also put in an amount for pANI
23 administration, and again that is just an estimate
24 since we don't have any information as to what that
25 might be. We're hoping it's a good estimate. For the

1 carrier audits, we've estimated another \$700,000 based
2 on discussions with the FCC. The billing collection
3 agent is a contract number. The data collection agent
4 is an estimate from the data collection agent.

5 Again, the operations audit is an estimate
6 of \$30,000, and the interest income is an estimate.
7 We expect to have more money because we'll be
8 collecting more money this year, so we expect a higher
9 interest. So that leaves us with projected
10 disbursements of \$5,843,000, plus we're assuming you
11 want to leave the \$1 million contingency provision, so
12 that means we need to fund \$6,843,370 this year. Are
13 there any questions about the budget?

14 Okay. The next page discusses the options,
15 the funding options, basically whether we use the
16 surplus or some of the surplus or none of the surplus
17 to fund these expenditures we expect. The first
18 option uses the full amount of the surplus that we
19 expect to be in place at June '06. That's \$2,200,000.
20 That will leave us with a contribution factor of
21 .00020.

22 And if we go to Option 2 which we had
23 projected a factor of 25 instead of 20. That would
24 leave not using the full surplus, leaving us \$1.1
25 million. That's option 2. Option 2 would be not

1 using the surplus at all. This would leave us with a
2 factor of 30, so those are the options. The billing
3 and collection agent working group is going to present
4 their recommendation based on these options. Are
5 there any questions?

6 MR. ATKINSON: Thank you. So now we get to
7 decide. Jim Castagna, with the North American
8 Numbering Council Billing and Collection Working
9 Group, and that report will be Document No. 10. Jim.

10 MR. CASTAGNA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
11 name is Jim Castagna with Verizon. Today, the billing
12 collection working group is going to recommend a
13 particular contribution factor. Just a quick summary
14 on the numbers, we're expecting that \$6.8 million will
15 be required in the next fiscal year which was the same
16 which was required in the current fiscal year.

17 The difference is that last year we had a
18 \$5.6 million surplus which was used to reduced the
19 contribution factor. This year we'll have a \$2.2
20 million surplus which will of course require a higher
21 contribution factor, so with that let's go behind the
22 cover page to the first page. Of course the billing
23 collection working group consulted with Welch and
24 Company. We considered pANI Administration carrier
25 audits and PA contract RFP, among other items that are

1 on the budget that were described to you by Faith.

2 We discussed three different options which
3 are also shown on the billing collection agent's
4 report as Options 1, 2 and 3. We recognize that the
5 carrier obligations would be \$6.8 million for the next
6 fiscal year, and that the \$83,000 remaining dollars
7 required from NANP funding is to come from
8 international participants, and also that the
9 anticipated surplus is \$2.2 million.

10 And the reason why we list that as
11 anticipated because until we get to the end of June,
12 we really won't know what the exact surplus is. If we
13 could turn the page, please? The billing collection
14 working group recommends that the council endorse
15 Option 1 which is calling for a contribution factor of
16 0.000020.

17 We would keep the contingency amount at \$1
18 million. We would consume the entire projected
19 surplus of \$2.2 million, and the net U.S. carrier
20 contributions would be \$4.6 million to meet the U.S.
21 funding requirement of \$6.8 million.

22 The rationale for that approach is that by
23 consuming the surplus each year, we provide a
24 contribution factor of long-term stability as compared
25 to letting the surplus accumulate. Of course, if we

1 let the surplus accumulate, eventually we'd have to
2 reconcile that surplus, and we would of course
3 experience a large swing in the contribution factor,
4 so by consuming this surplus each year, it seems that
5 we will have more of a consistent contribution factor
6 each year as well.

7 The \$1 million contingency provides a
8 sufficient buffer as we've experienced last year, and
9 last year the factor was 0.0000052, and stakeholder
10 were informed to anticipate that the factor will
11 return to approximately 0.000025 in fiscal year
12 '06/'07, so what we're proposing in Option 1 is
13 0.000020 which is approximately what we believed to be
14 a reasonable factor for this year based upon
15 information we had last year at the time of making
16 that forecast. Any questions so far?

17 Okay. What we did on the next slide is we
18 put together a little history of the contribution
19 factor. There were some changes in some of the fiscal
20 years, so there's two columns there. One is the
21 originally proposed factor, and the second column is
22 the final number so you could see where the
23 contribution factors stood in the prior years.

24 And at the bottom we have proposed Option 1
25 which shows a contribution factor of 0.020, so it

1 looks as though that we will be returning to nominal
2 contribution factor range of 0.020 next fiscal year,
3 and certainly if we continue to consume surplus if
4 surplus remains below \$2 million and everything else
5 remains the same, we could probably expect a
6 contribution factor in the 0.025 range going forward.

7 Okay. On the next slide, the recommendation
8 is like an action item list. Here we're asking the
9 NANC to spend \$6.8 million. Well, actually we all
10 expected that, but we're asking NANC to ask Welch and
11 Company to employ the approach described in Option 1
12 when preparing its FCC filing.

13 We're asking NANC to ask Welch and Company
14 to share the draft filing with the billing collection
15 working group prior to the filing due date, and that's
16 just a step that is used to review the filing before
17 they submit it so that a second set of eyes could take
18 a look at it, and this way all the NANC members need
19 not be concerned that they know the billing collection
20 working group is managing and monitoring the process
21 appropriately.

22 What we'd like NANC to ask Welch and Company
23 to do is to obtain the contribution base from NECA in
24 April to calculate the exact contribution factor.
25 Recognizing that the contribution base is used in

1 calculating the contribution factor, when they get the
2 final numbers from NECA, the anticipated contribution
3 factor may change, but it would take a lot, probably a
4 large change in the base for the contribution factor
5 to change.

6 So there might be differences in numbers
7 that you're seeing today on this presentation as well
8 as some of the numbers that were shown on Welch and
9 Company's presentation, just a heads up on that. And
10 also we asked NANC to ask Welch and Company to prepare
11 an FCC filing reflecting the contribution factor and
12 budgeted amounts corresponding to Option 1.

13 And of course the last item is there for
14 informational purposes. We don't try to direct the
15 FCC to do anything, but we're asking people to
16 recognize that the next step is for the FCC to direct
17 the agent to implement Option 1 for fiscal year
18 '06/'07. Any questions?

19 MR. ATKINSON: I've got a couple just for
20 clarification. In sense by consuming the surplus, you
21 consume the million dollar contingency, but then you
22 budget a million dollar contingency, and I think
23 that's how I understand it mechanically. The specific
24 question I have though is there any possibility of in
25 a sense the cashflow such that the million dollars

1 isn't in fact available at any time in terms of the
2 outflow and the inflow

3 MR. CASTAGNA: Well, in my understanding of
4 the process, and I'll ask Faith to correct me if I'm
5 wrong, the million dollar contingency is going to be
6 available on the first month of the fiscal year, so
7 you'll always have a million dollars there. It's not
8 like we need to accrue excess monies during the fiscal
9 year to accrue the million dollars.

10 MR. ATKINSON: Yes. I mean, I think if
11 you're going to have a contingency, it needs to be
12 case.

13 MR. CASTAGNA: To be there from the start.

14 MR. ATKINSON: There needs to be cash
15 available at all times. Okay. My other questions go
16 to the timing here. Just working backwards, the FCC
17 issues an order with the contribution rate. Is the
18 XTANT order, does that terminate at any time, or does
19 the current rate of 0.52 continue until the FCC issues
20 an order? You know, I'm looking at a June date, and
21 that's kind of close.

22 MR. CASTAGNA: Well, my understanding of the
23 process is that when the billing collection agent
24 files for a contribution factor and budget, it's for a
25 particular fiscal year. And the process established

1 today is similar to that use last year in which would
2 involve Welch and Company submitting a filing which if
3 endorsed by the NANC today probably wouldn't cause any
4 concern in terms of the FCC's response.

5 Although I believe if there is no response
6 from the FCC that Welch and Company probably would not
7 be able to begin issuing bills for the new fiscal
8 year, and I would have to defer to Faith from Welch
9 and Company regarding the process if she didn't get a
10 response from the FCC.

11 MR. ATKINSON: Where is Faith? Do you have
12 any views on that, or do you recall what your limits
13 are in terms of direction?

14 (Away from microphone.)

15 MS. MARCOTTE: I don't (inaudible).

16 MR. ATKINSON: And you bill quarterly or
17 monthly?

18 MS. MARCOTTE: No. Most of them pay
19 annually.

20 MR. ATKINSON: Annually? Okay.

21 MS. MARCOTTE: They are not to pay until we
22 do in May. They (inaudible) do June or June 12, so we
23 need to get a response I guess (inaudible) early
24 (inaudible).

25 MR. ATKINSON: So you actually need to send

1 a bill out in May with the new contribution rate?

2 MS. MARCOTTE: That's right.

3 MR. ATKINSON: I'm sort of going through
4 this for the benefit of our new friends from the FCC
5 just so they understand some of the timeframes we're
6 working here.

7 MR. CASTAGNA: Well, theoretically though
8 the FCC authorizes payments, so even if a new
9 contribution factor wasn't approved, we have a \$2.2
10 million surplus and the million dollar contingency
11 that would probably hold Welch and Company and the
12 industry through several months as FCC authorized
13 payments but did not approve any new collections.

14 MR. ATKINSON: Yes. I mean, hopefully we
15 can avoid all that and keep it smooth, but it's
16 important to think of that.

17 MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Qwest.
18 Historically, this is the way it generally has gone is
19 that the agent sends in their filing to the FCC in
20 May, and during that timeframe the FCC responds in
21 time for them to do the billing.

22 Now, I know that, and, Michael, if you
23 remember differently, help me with this, that it
24 sometimes was right up to the wire to get the FCC
25 order, but they always made it in time for the billing

1 to be done, so historically when NBANC did and now
2 last year I don't think we should see a problem with
3 it.

4 MR. ATKINSON: But there is a tight window
5 here.

6 MS. RETKA: Yes.

7 MR. ATKINSON: Okay. That's really what I
8 want to emphasize as much of anything to the FCC
9 staff, otherwise when people don't get paid, things
10 get ugly, so that's my questions at this stage. Any
11 other questions? Anna?

12 MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. Jim, I
13 think you just eased my mind a little bit because
14 there is an existing \$2.2 million surplus that will be
15 depleted over time as this new contribution factor
16 comes in, and you said that the million will always be
17 there. But I guess the one unknown is the renewal of
18 the pooling administrator contract, and I just
19 wondered what type of discussion did you have about
20 that.

21 The assumption here is that it's at the same
22 rate, yet I heard in the pooling report that the pool
23 assignments were up over 47 percent in 2005 over 2004,
24 so was there discussion then about that unknown, and
25 do you feel comfortable given the surpluses that exist

1 that that can be accommodated?

2 MR. CASTAGNA: I'd have to say that although
3 I did miss a meeting, and I asked Rosemary to make up
4 for any discussion I wasn't aware of, the volume of
5 blocks was not to my knowledge discussed as much as
6 the context of the contract in terms of what we sensed
7 would be a competitive price given that there is an
8 expectation that other companies will be bidding.

9 The competitive environment will keep the
10 price at or below, however, with the million dollar
11 contingency and provisions we put in for the function
12 of the pANI administration we felt that and everyone
13 including Welch and Company who had discussed, you
14 know, the budget felt comfortable with the budget
15 considering the million dollar contingency was there.

16 Rosemary, do you have something to add, please?

17 MS. EMMER: Yes, and just that in fact this
18 did come up, Welch and Company brought this up when
19 they initially provided the budget and the options to
20 us, and it was definitely a discussion item, and again
21 everything that Jim said is absolutely true that we
22 ended up to deciding to keep it exactly the way it was
23 from last year, and we also did add the pANI.

24 If you noticed in the budget we added
25 something -- 150. Yes. For pANI without knowing what

1 that would be. We went ahead and put something in
2 there. Welch and Company went ahead and put something
3 in there for us. Thank you.

4 MR. CASTAGNA: And just one other point.
5 There is a box describing accrued liabilities, and
6 sometimes when you can't pay the heating bill, they
7 don't turn it off right away, so if we come up short
8 on funds, you know, we just pay when we have the
9 money. I mean, you can't pay if you don't have the
10 money.

11 FEMALE VOICE: Well, I don't think that
12 that's the management plan.

13 MR. ATKINSON: No. No, it isn't the
14 management plan, but I just wanted to point out that
15 there is such an entry as accrued liabilities. John?

16 MR. JEFFERSON: Yes. John Jefferson, AT&T.
17 We went through this exercise last year as well. We
18 had a surplus, right? Or is this the first?

19 MR. CASTAGNA: Last year we had a
20 significant surplus. It was over \$5 million.

21 MR. JEFFERSON: Right. Okay. So I was just
22 curious. Had some thought gone into the year after a
23 surplus year would be a good year to start paying into
24 this, and entities that have been paying into this
25 fund in prior years now that have created the surplus

1 lower the contribution rate for everyone in this
2 succeeding year, and I was just wondering if some
3 thought had gone into how that works?

4 I'm not informed enough to know if there are
5 new entrants coming in paying this year into this, but
6 I just looked at the numbers and thought I'd ask that
7 question.

8 MR. CASTAGNA: We considered a similar issue
9 of character when it comes to paying, who pays, who
10 paid, who should be paying last year, when we had the
11 significant surplus, and at the time there was a
12 discussion regarding how difficult or almost
13 impossible and inaccurate it would be to try to go
14 back to see who contributed and who should be entitled
15 to a refund.

16 The cost and the effort and considering the
17 complexity of that process and the risk of not being
18 accurate was too great to consider pursuing that
19 approach. However, we did not consider that type of
20 analysis this year because this is a forward-looking
21 budget in terms of what we intend to spend next year,
22 and there is no annual reconciliation, what was paid
23 and what should have been paid because the
24 contribution factor is established for each fiscal
25 year.

1 So if you're a telecommunications provider,
2 and you need to participate and contribute your fair
3 share, it's based on the contribution factor related
4 to the year that you're in service and using NANPs or
5 NANP numbers, so with that type of philosophy it's not
6 something where we always go back to see, you know,
7 was there anything that should have or could have been
8 done when there is a surplus.

9 MR. JEFFERSON: And just a quick follow-up
10 to that, and I might be missing the boat here, and
11 this might have already been explained, but is there
12 any thought to using the contingency or some monies,
13 and it might be the purpose of the contingency so that
14 you can cut it a little closer so then instead of
15 getting a surplus you might run a deficit, but you
16 have a way to account for that if anything? Kind of
17 like doing your taxes. Your goal is to get to zero at
18 the end of the year.

19 MR. CASTAGNA: Well, we don't have anything
20 that we are aware of that may use contingency month.

21 MR. ATKINSON: Well, no. We do. We have
22 two unknowns which is the new PA rate and the pANI
23 rate. I mean, those are just plug numbers at this
24 stage, and you just don't know what they're going to
25 be.

1 MR. CASTAGNA: Yes. Maybe I should have
2 rephrased that. If we have an anticipated
3 expenditure, we would put that as a budget item, but
4 we don't have any specificity or details that would
5 warrant a specific individual budget item, and
6 therefore what I'm trying to say is that unless we
7 have details or specific information that we could use
8 to adjust the budgeted item or create a new budget
9 item, we can't do that, and therefore the contingency
10 is there in case we need money.

11 But there's nothing that we know, you know,
12 we'll consume a contingency. We know that any of the
13 budgeted line items may be insufficient and require
14 the use of contingency, but there are no plans to use
15 the contingency unless something unexpected happens.

16 MR. ATKINSON: For example, I mean the FCC
17 could decide to do a whole bunch more audits, right?

18 MR. CASTAGNA: That's correct.

19 MR. ATKINSON: Mary?

20 MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Qwest. What you
21 have to remember though is you have to go based on the
22 historic experience and can't run in the black, so you
23 have to have a contingency, and that was one of the
24 requirements that came out is that you can't run in
25 the black when you're doing this effort, and then you

1 have to remember that when we've previously seen the
2 second round of a contract, they've come in lower.

3 In fact, much lower, that's why we had such
4 a big surplus the last time that had to be dealt with.

5 Do you want to add anything Michael?

6 (Away from microphone.)

7 MR. WHALEY: Just to (inaudible) not being
8 able to (inaudible) pass the torch to each generation.

9 Perhaps the issues of having a surplus which is a
10 pleasant problem to have are in part due to the legal
11 reality that this fund can't borrow. So it really
12 does have to fund on a going-forward basis, and to the
13 question about trying to somehow track benefits to
14 prior payors, we're really dealing in one sense with
15 an accrual issue.

16 The budgets are put together each year
17 knowing what the contract terms are going to be, and
18 sometimes to the vendors' disappointment, the FCC
19 doesn't necessarily approve the payments in time, and
20 it becomes an accrual matter, to much of the money
21 that was collected last year was for the services
22 rendered last year, but may not have been paid and is
23 carried over. Every year there's a slightly different
24 mix of accrual issues. That timing also complicates
25 the budget presentation.

1 MR. ATKINSON: John?

2 MR. JEFFERSON: John Jefferson, AT&T. Yes.

3 It's indeed a cruel world. I had to get that one in.

4 Accounting 101 joke. Okay. So if we talk surplus

5 though, now I'm starting to understand this

6 contingency as a million dollar surplus in a sense

7 already. Is that the wrong way to look at it?

8 Because if it is, then maybe we could work toward

9 getting it so that if we have any cushion at all, it's
10 just going to be to contingency.

11 But going over, and obviously it's a goal of
12 the working group, too, but I just wanted to make it
13 clear that that's how I'm thinking about it now that
14 we've got two years in a row of surplus that maybe
15 we're overcorrecting based on the accruals and other
16 things that we anticipate might impact any given
17 budget year.

18 MR. CASTAGNA: The contingency is the only
19 monies that are there in case we need them. It really
20 can't be considered surplus if we keep it there year
21 over year. The contingency is set to \$1 million.
22 Even with that million dollars we have an additional
23 anticipated surplus of \$2.2 million. So by keeping
24 the million dollar cushion and consuming the surplus
25 as recommended in Option 1, we believe we have a

1 viable budget, and something that's going to keep us,
2 you know, in the black until next fiscal year.

3 As far as trying to tweak, you know, the
4 budget for the pooling administration, I think it
5 would probably send the wrong signal to the industry
6 who's competing for that contract to up the number and
7 give them the impression that we want to spend more
8 money or maybe even to lower the number because then
9 that might, you know, force us into a situation where
10 we needed to consume more money than anticipated.

11 So by leaving it where it is, we send no
12 signal at all, so there is other reasons also for
13 doing that, but I think the best reason was is because
14 we believe that that number would be the most
15 appropriate number given what we anticipate happening
16 next year including the re-bid and pANI administration
17 and audits and all that other stuff that goes into the
18 budget.

19 MR. ATKINSON: Any other questions? If not,
20 we've got a couple of items on the table here, so
21 we've been asked for two decisions at the NANC level.

22 First is to ask Welch and Co. to employ the approach
23 described in Option 1 when preparing the FCC filing.
24 Any objections? So Welch we're on board with
25 Option 1.

1 And then the second one is to ask Welch and
2 Co. to share the draft filing with the billing
3 collection working group prior to the filing due date,
4 and implicit in that is essentially that NANC is
5 giving the billing collection working group authority
6 just to sort of oversee the preparation of that
7 document. Any objections? So, Welch, we in fact
8 share that, and then of course there's these other
9 items to Welch.

10 Now, I guess the only point I would make is
11 the sooner the better in terms of the filing. What is
12 the date in April that you would be getting the input
13 from NECA? Any idea?

14 (Away from microphone.)

15 FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible) use that.

16 MR. ATKINSON: Use that?

17 FEMALE VOICE: And it's at the end --

18 MR. ATKINSON: End of April.

19 FEMALE VOICE: Here are some of the reports
20 (inaudible).

21 MR. ATKINSON: I'll leave it up to maybe the
22 billing collection working group and Welch together.
23 I don't know if there's any way even to send in a
24 filing to the FCC and then amend it if necessarily
25 just to try to speed things along, or maybe that will

1 confuse things at the FCC. I don't know. I mean, to
2 have two filings. Rosemary?

3 MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint
4 Nextel, and we are working with Welch on that. We did
5 develop sort of a draft timeline, and we have
6 conference calls scheduled, so as soon as we can get
7 to that. We're definitely tracking it in other words.
8 I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Welch
9 and Company for an outstanding job in preparing and
10 delivering the proposed budget as well as the options
11 for the contribution factor.

12 They made our lives as B&C working group co-
13 chairs and the members extremely easy this year by
14 going over those line by line and having all of the
15 right people on the phone. That includes Faith,
16 Heather and Garth, and they just did an excellent job.
17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. ATKINSON: Duly noted. So the only
19 other item then -- I mean, the only thing I see out of
20 all this is we do have a potential timing problem. We
21 need to get a filing to the FCC as soon as possible,
22 and then we need the FCC to act on that promptly so
23 that the bills can go out.

24 I'm thinking if they're not going to get
25 this USAC data until the end of April, a couple of

1 days, even if you could get the filing to the FCC by
2 the 1st of May, the chances of getting a decision --
3 when do you send out the bills, Faith?

4 MS. MARCOTTE: Around the 20th of May.

5 MR. ATKINSON: What happens if you don't get
6 an FCC approval by the 20th of May? What do you do?

7 MS. MARCOTTE: Send them out later.

8 MR. ATKINSON: Send them out later. Okay.

9 And at what point does that become a cashflow problem?

10 A few months because we've got a million dollars
11 sitting in the bank?

12 FEMALE VOICE: We've got 2.2.

13 MALE VOICE: We've got \$3 million.

14 MR. ATKINSON: Yes. Okay. Well, I mean
15 everyone understands the realities, so let's hope that
16 the scheduling works out. Anything else for Jim?

17 MR. CASTAGNA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 MR. ATKINSON: Thank you. The next item on
19 our agenda is reports from the issues management
20 group. The only one that I am aware of will be the
21 operating manual, and I would suggest to our folks
22 from the policy division everything you in theory need
23 to know about NANC, how it works, is in here.

24 In fact, this operating manual was developed
25 for new members, but I think it would equally go well

1 for people at the FCC who are jumping into the middle
2 of NANC, so, Rosemary, do you have anything to add,
3 otherwise this is my end.

4 MS. EMMER: Yes. It now belongs to you, Mr.
5 Chairman, for update.

6 MR. ATKINSON: I am now the custodian of the
7 operating manual Version 1. I did note a couple of
8 things. I'll even want to just update myself, and
9 eventually I'll issue a Rev. 1.1, but unless anyone
10 has any other comments, I'd like to thank the IMG for
11 a great piece of work. And I think I would actually
12 ask the FCC staff if you look through this, and if
13 there are other things in here that you need to know,
14 or if it doesn't answer your questions about how NANC
15 is working, let us know, and we'll expand it because
16 any new NANC member, and we will have new members
17 periodically. I just hope we will help them figure
18 out what goes on here, so thank you, Rosemary, and the
19 IMG, and the final document, their report would be
20 Document No. 11.

21 That gets us to Agenda Item 10, report of
22 the Local Number Portability Administration, and whose
23 giving that report? That would be Gary Sacra. Gary's
24 report is Document 12.

25 MR. SACRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good

1 morning, everyone. The first item on the report
2 relates to NPAC Software Release 3.3. Some good news
3 there. Release 3.3 was successfully loaded in the
4 West Coast regional impact this past February 26.
5 It's running smoothly. No issues identified to date,
6 and the remaining production load dates are continuing
7 to be on schedule.

8 After about a one-month SOA period for the
9 first region, Release 3.3. will be loaded in the
10 southeast and western regions on March 26, the
11 northeast and midwest regions on April 2, and then
12 we'll finish up in the mid-Atlantic and the southwest
13 and the impact test there on April 9.

14 An update on the disaster preparation
15 subteam of the LNPA working group and the final report
16 on out of LATA porting and pooling for disaster relief
17 in response to Hurricane Katrina. We have moved up
18 our scheduled completion date for the final report in
19 response to their -- to meet the needs of the FCC's
20 Katrina panel who had requested that the final report
21 if possible be completed by May 1.

22 We've moved up our date to mid-April in
23 order to be able to present it or submit it to the
24 NANC and the NANPM LLC and give the council a couple
25 of weeks to be able to read through the report in

1 order to then submit it to the Katrina panel.

2 MR. ATKINSON: Let me suggest just so the
3 Katrina panel gets it as soon as possible that we
4 could probably adopt that even by some sort of
5 electronic means from NANC. I mean, giving it NANC
6 approval.

7 MR. SACRA: Right. Because there won't be
8 another NANC meeting prior to --

9 MR. ATKINSON: Yes. Our next NANC meeting
10 is middle of May.

11 MR. SACRA: Right.

12 MR. ATKINSON: So as soon as it's ready,
13 launch it, send it around to NANC and if necessary we
14 can have a quick conference call or something like
15 that, and there may be another reason to have a
16 conference call between now and May anyway.

17 MR. SACRA: Okay. That will work fine.

18 MR. ATKINSON: Thanks.

19 MR. SACRA: And I believe it was the
20 November 30 meeting. There was some discussion
21 surrounding how many numbers were actually ported or
22 pooled across LATA boundaries, and again this is not
23 the official number since the report has not been
24 completely finalized yet, but unofficially and subject
25 to change upon final review.

1 Based on input from service providers that
2 did port or pool numbers across LATA boundaries in
3 response to Hurricane Katrina, it appears that
4 somewhere in the vicinity of a quarter million numbers
5 were moved across LATA boundaries, and these are
6 working numbers, customer-assigned numbers.
7 Approximately, a quarter of a million were either
8 ported or pooled across LATA boundaries to provide
9 some portion of service to those impacted customers.

10 Again, that number will be further reviewed
11 and finalized per the completed report. Any questions
12 on that? We're shooting for around April 15 to not
13 only get our taxes in, but also get the report to the
14 NANC, so no particular priority order there.

15 The next item is the NANC change order
16 requirements update. Again, the LNP working group is
17 blowing the dust off literally on the accepted change
18 orders that remain in the pool of change orders.
19 We're going through those change orders. The service
20 provider is the first step, developed a level of
21 interest for each of the change orders. Some were
22 eliminated. Some we decided to continue to move
23 forward and develop the technical requirements, so
24 that's where we're at right now.

25 We're in the process of continuing to either

1 review the existing requirements -- some of the change
2 orders we had already developed requirements for
3 months ago. Some still require the development of the
4 technical requirements, so we're in the process now of
5 going through those accepted change orders and make
6 sure that the requirements are developed.

7 And then at some point in time there will be
8 a decision point in our process to determine whether
9 or not there's enough interest in the change orders to
10 perhaps start to develop a software release package,
11 but again that process or that point in the process is
12 down the road a ways.

13 Okay. The final portion of the report is
14 the PIMs. I just wanted to highlight that we have
15 closed a number of PIMs as a result of the successful
16 Release 3.3 load in the West Coast region. Those are
17 PIM 22, PIM 36 and PIM 38. Those PIMs were addressed
18 by change orders that were in Release 3.3, so we had
19 been tracking those PIMs until Release 3.3 was loaded.

20 Now, that it has been successfully loaded in
21 the West Coast, and testing has proved that those
22 change orders do address those issues, we decided to
23 close those PIMs. PIM 28 was also closed. Again,
24 this was a PIM that was addressed by a software change
25 in the wireless carrier interface specification

1 guidelines of what's known as the WCUS guidelines.

2 Those are guidelines for the intercarrier
3 communication processes between wireless carriers and
4 also it involves wireline to wireless and wireless to
5 wireline porting as well, so that particular PIM was
6 successfully addressed with this Release 3.3 which has
7 now been implemented, and just to finish up the PIM
8 report, there was a new PIM accepted at last week's
9 LNPA working group meeting. It was a PIM submitted by
10 Verizon Wireless.

11 Again, it has been accepted by the group for
12 working within the LNPA. The PIM seeks to address
13 instances of providers who have in some cases have
14 been taking numbers back that it ported out from them
15 because they had no evidence that they had submitted a
16 firm order confirmation to the provider that had that
17 ported in number.

18 In one instance that was discussed during
19 last week's meeting was actually two years after the
20 number had ported, a provider took that number back,
21 ported it back because they did not have evidence in
22 their systems that they had ever issued a firm order
23 confirmation. And obviously when that happens, the
24 customer is taken out of service. So that PIM was
25 just submitted at last week's meeting, we've accepted

1 it, we'll be working on that in the upcoming meetings.

2 Right now it looks like we will be at the
3 very least including something in the LNP working
4 group's number portability best practices document to
5 address this particular issue. Questions on the PIMs?

6 I heard the discussion, the gentleman from
7 California asked the question about I guess unassigned
8 number porting. I don't have any personal knowledge
9 of anything in MPA 310, but just my recollection there
10 was an initiative a number of years back to determine
11 the feasibility of unassigned number porting to move
12 unassigned numbers from carrier to carrier to populate
13 their inventory, and my recollection was that the
14 project was I guess -- the decision was not to move
15 forward with that.

16 I know there were some issues. Some
17 providers had problems with porting unassigned numbers
18 that weren't associated with specific customers
19 because at least in their systems the only way to
20 guarantee that a particular number was not assigned
21 either to another customer or as a working telephone
22 number or as a billing number, the only way to
23 guarantee that was to run it completely through their
24 service order system. And in order to do that, they
25 had to have a customer associated with that number.

1 That was the input from a number of
2 providers, so what was called the unassigned number
3 porting project I believe as an industry was put on
4 hold, but I don't know any of the specifics about
5 anything that's taken place in 310.

6 MR. ATKINSON: Jerome?

7 MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.
8 Thank you very much for that background, and because
9 many industry segments had pressed for UNP and the FCC
10 had considered this issue as well as NANC, I'd
11 appreciate that if this matter does come up again
12 before your working group, you know, that we'll hear
13 about it here.

14 MR. SACRA: You certainly will if it does
15 come up.

16 MR. CANDELARIA: Great.

17 MR. ATKINSON: Any other questions? Thank
18 you, Gary.

19 MR. SACRA: Thank you very much, everybody.

20 MR. ATKINSON: Just housekeeping. My
21 assumption is that we can get everything concluded
22 here by about 12:30, so unless anybody really wants to
23 take the lunch break at 12:00 and come back, I think
24 we should plow ahead and try to get finished by, let's
25 say, 12:30. So, folks, is that okay for you back

1 there in the sound booth? Okay. So let's plow ahead.

2 Next report will be from the Numbering Oversight
3 Working Group, the NOWG, and this would be Karen.

4 MS. RIEPENKROGER: I'm Karen Riepenkroger.
5 I'm one of the chairs of the NOWG along with Rosemary
6 Emmer and Natalie McNamer, and Rosemary is with Sprint
7 Nextel, and Natalie is with T-Mobile.

8 MR. ATKINSON: Thank you, and is this your
9 first time presenting here?

10 MS. RIEPENKROGER: I did this one other
11 time.

12 MR. ATKINSON: One other time. Okay.

13 MS. RIEPENKROGER: So if I seem a little
14 nervous, I might be.

15 MR. ATKINSON: No. We're a friendly group.
16 Karen's report will be Document No. 13.

17 MS. RIEPENKROGER: Today we're going to
18 cover NeuStar. We had a NeuStar 5-percent or greater
19 shareholder certification and NOWG's response. We'll
20 review the status of the NANPA and the PA 2005
21 performance evaluation survey status. We'll also
22 review the NANPA/PA 2005 survey proposed timeline, and
23 we'll show you our March 2006 meeting schedule.

24 Go to Slide 3. On February 22, NeuStar
25 notified the Wireline Competition Bureau FCC via

1 letter regarding a shareholder, Alliance Capital
2 Management, of owning 5 percent or more NeuStar
3 equity, and the Commission requires any entity owning
4 five percent or more of NeuStar equity to certify to
5 NeuStar that it is not a telecommunications service
6 provider or affiliate, and the certification was
7 attached to the letter.

8 Chairman Atkinson directed the NOWG to
9 consider this notification on behalf of the NANC, and
10 the NOWG was tasked with providing feedback to the
11 NANC during the March 2006 meeting of any issues or
12 concerns regarding the contents of this notification.

13 The NOWG met and discussed this notice and
14 has no known issues or concerns regarding the
15 neutrality of the shareholder change. This decision
16 is premised on the assumption that the other
17 investments held in Alliance Capital's portfolios are
18 in keeping with FCC neutrality policies. Are there
19 any questions?

20 Next slide. Slide 4, status of the NANPA
21 and the PA 2005 performance evaluation surveys. The
22 survey process was initiated on schedule. January 3,
23 2006, and the surveys have been sent to the NANC
24 distro (phonetic). The PA and the NANPA have sent
25 exploder emails, notifications, and the surveys have

1 been posted to the NANPA and the PA website as well as
2 the NANC chair website, and the survey due date
3 response was February 28, and the date has been
4 extended to March 17.

5 And I do want to note that throughout the
6 course since January, the NANPA and the PA have sent
7 out several notifications, and each time that they
8 have sent out a notification, we have received
9 responses, so it seems to trigger people's minds that
10 hey I really do need to respond, and so we found that
11 the notifications, the interim notifications that the
12 PA and the NANPA did for us were extremely beneficial.

13 Any questions?

14 MR. ATKINSON: When we extended the date,
15 that was what? February 27, or at least we decided to
16 do that, and the numbers were looking kind of mediocre
17 two and a half weeks ago, and is there any update on
18 the responses?

19 MS. RIEPENKROGER: Yes, I can. For the
20 NANPA to date we have -- I'll just kind of break it
21 down for you. Twenty-two state commissions have
22 responded with a NANPA survey, 31 service providers
23 have responded, and we had one individual other than a
24 service provider commission respond, and for the PA to
25 date we have 63 service providers have responded, 26

1 state commissions have responded, and we had one other
2 individual response for the PA.

3 MR. ATKINSON: That's a reasonable update in
4 two and a half weeks. I guess so we got three more
5 days?

6 MS. RIEPENKROGER: Right. And I compared it
7 to 2004. It just maybe a little more information than
8 you want, but compared to 2005 I guess the survey --
9 we're just pretty much on target. For the NANPA we
10 had 68 surveys total combined, and the for the PA we
11 had 97, so today we're standing at 90 for the PA and
12 54 for the NANPA.

13 MR. ATKINSON: Okay. Well, if anybody
14 hasn't sent their survey in, please do. I would
15 expect everybody around this table. If any NANC
16 member hasn't sent in their survey, instead of going
17 from positive reinforcement, we'll go to negative
18 reinforcement.

19 MS. RIEPENKROGER: I will note that there's
20 been some surveys that we have received that they just
21 send a blank survey. So the chairs have sent them
22 back out to the people to ask them to say you send us
23 the wrong form, so we're endeavoring to try to get as
24 many responses as we can get for the surveys.

25 MR. ATKINSON: All right.

1 MS. RIEPENKROGER: Is there any other
2 questions on the surveys? The next slide is our
3 performance evaluation proposed schedule. We're
4 meeting with week with -- no. Let me take a step
5 back. The NANPA and the PA surveys are due on Friday,
6 March 17. That's St. Patrick's Day, so everybody
7 please be sure to get them in on time. We are meeting
8 this week with the NANPA for our annual operational
9 review, and that's on March 15 and 16.

10 We'll be going out to the PA's offices in
11 Concord, California, to do the operational review on
12 April 4 and 5. We will be meeting in Denver April 18
13 to the 20 to prepare the NANPA and the PA performance
14 reports, and on May 3 we will be meeting with the FCC,
15 the NANPA and the PA here in Washington, D.C. to share
16 the preliminary results. Are there any questions?
17 Yes, Rosemary?

18 MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint
19 Nextel, and I should have changed the slide. The date
20 for May 3 is no longer tentative with the FCC. We
21 were able to get that date in stone, and we're working
22 with the PA and NANPA on the times now.

23 MS. RIEPENKROGER: Thank you. And I should
24 have mentioned that. Any other questions? The last
25 slide is just our activity for March, and it's pretty

1 much we're going to do the NANPA operational review on
2 the 15th and 16th. Our standing monthly call with
3 NANPA will be moved to March 28, and the PA standing
4 agenda with the NOWG is on March 30.

5 MR. ATKINSON: Anything else? That wasn't
6 so bad.

7 MS. RIEPENKROGER: Thank you very much. I
8 was fine.

9 MR. ATKINSON: The last of our working group
10 reports, future of numbering, Karen Mulberry, and we
11 do not have any documents for discussion on this
12 agenda item, but hopefully the FoN can get going on
13 some new projects.

14 MS. MULBERRY: I seem to say good morning
15 for the last five minutes of the morning. I'm Karen
16 Mulberry. I'm with Verizon, and I am one of the co-
17 chairs of the pANI IMGs, so I'll address that first.
18 I wanted to let you know that the pANI IMG has
19 completed its work.

20 It has prepared a report and recommendations
21 for the NANC on permanent pANI administration, and I
22 will let Bob address the process that's going to go
23 forward with that report. And then secondly for the
24 future of numbering working group, we've been on
25 hiatus since we've been focusing most of our energies

1 on the pANI work. Some time between now and the end
2 of the month, Hoke and I will send out an announcement
3 for a conference call. The FoN is going to start
4 meeting again.

5 One, we need to elect a new co-chair because
6 Hoke is going to be transitioning off into other
7 items, so we'll have an agenda out and let everyone
8 know to think about whether they want to take on the
9 mantle of co-chair, the FoN or not, and that's all I
10 have to report.

11 MR. ATKINSON: Good. And remember, the FoN
12 was established it seems like probably even close to a
13 year ago for the purpose of trying to get ahead of new
14 developments and has been consumed in putting out
15 fires.

16 If you remember the Navy RFP, this pANI
17 issue, a couple of other things. So hopefully now
18 they finished the firefighting and can actually sit
19 back and think about the future of numbering and
20 issues that are a little further but that need some
21 thoughtful advance work. So I look forward to the
22 future of numbering working group actually getting
23 down to contemplating the real future of this and look
24 forward to that.

25 MS. MULBERRY: We had started to prepare a

1 draft report, and it kept track of the numerous items
2 that have come up since last year that you have kicked
3 our way that we haven't addressed yet. So we have a
4 list of things that need to be addressed once the FoN
5 starts to even begin.

6 MR. ATKINSON: All right. Thank you very
7 much.

8 MS. MULBERRY: Okay.

9 MR. ATKINSON: And we'll probably have a
10 conference call and maybe, you know, sometime between
11 now and the next meeting we can do this LNPA working
12 group things, maybe the pANI thing and a couple of
13 other things, so we'll let you know on that. Let me
14 ask just from a housekeeping point of view. I don't
15 think we had any special presentations. Rosemary?

16 MS. EMMER: I'm sorry, Chairman. Rosemary
17 Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I was waiting for the pANI
18 report, and I don't understand what happened to the
19 pANI report. You might have just said it, and I was
20 zoning out.

21 MR. ATKINSON: Right at the beginning of the
22 meeting I said we wouldn't be discussing that today.
23 It's not yet ripe for discussion in terms of some
24 other issues going on, so we put that off, and my
25 expectation we'll do a conference call or something

1 like that. I don't know exactly when.

2 MS. EMMER: So we're not planning on waiting
3 for the next meeting?

4 MR. ATKINSON: I'd like to push ahead with
5 that as soon as we can, and I'll let you know when we
6 can.

7 MS. EMMER: Okay. I just wanted to make
8 sure that I reiterate to everyone on the team that
9 this is extremely important from Sprint Nextel's
10 position as well as I'm sure many other companies, and
11 we were really looking forward to hearing the pANI
12 report this afternoon and maybe coming to consensus on
13 that. So anything you could do to speed that up
14 before the next meeting, we'd be greatly appreciative.
15 Thank you.

16 MR. ATKINSON: Thank you for that comment.
17 I will do my best. Thank you. I don't think we had
18 any special presentations scheduled, at least none
19 that I was aware of, correct? Good. So that takes
20 care of 13. We have an updated list of NANC
21 accomplishments. Thank you, Debbie, for doing that.
22 Debbie's list here will be Document No. 14, and if
23 anyone notes any additional items that are not on this
24 list, let us know.

25 Summary of action assignments, Item No. 15.

1 I have two. First, is for INC to address the
2 guidelines or review the guideline's language to
3 resolve Don Gray's concerns. There was NANC consensus
4 on that in terms of the substance, and as an action
5 assignment for the chair to follow up on the INC 407
6 resolution. I don't have any others. Did anybody
7 else take any action assignments or anybody volunteer
8 for one that I didn't get? Members of the
9 public? Anybody from the public? Microphone is up
10 here. No public comments. Is there any other
11 business? Mr. Gray?

12 MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska. I just
13 wanted to give you an update to an earlier comment. I
14 can now officially tell you that the Nebraska Public
15 Service Commission has issued an order for mandatory
16 pooling in those rate centers in which the incumbent
17 carrier is currently Altel, Qwest or Frontier who have
18 been working very closely with us in voluntary
19 pooling, and working with us to conserve that life.

20 We have also issued the orders that all
21 carriers in those 155 rate centers in the next 45 days
22 will review their inventories, and donate those blocks
23 that meets the criteria for pooling, and the third
24 part is that we will have a hearing on the 9th of May
25 to address the 95 remaining rate centers that have

1 rural carriers involved to determine an appropriate
2 timeline, steps and progression to take in taking
3 those rate centers to mandatory pooling.

4 MR. ATKINSON: Nebraska leads the country.
5 Anna?

6 MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile.
7 Just on your action item list, just a couple of
8 follow-ups. There was the issue of the Katrina report
9 that we were going to review.

10 MR. ATKINSON: Yes.

11 MS. MILLER: So is it going to be a
12 conference call to address the -- are you going to do
13 that electronically?

14 MR. ATKINSON: Well, I think documents will
15 be distributed electronically, and then we'll have I
16 think a conference call definitely as soon as I think
17 in a sense -- well I can imagine two things that we
18 might be discussing. Hopefully, the schedules will
19 come together so we only have to have one call between
20 LNPA --

21 MS. MILLER: Okay. So potentially we can
22 have a conference call to talk about the pANI report
23 and also the Katrina report?

24 MR. ATKINSON: Right. Ideally, it will be
25 one, but it could be two. Anything else? All right.

1 So our next meeting will be on Tuesday, May 16. My
2 co-chair may in fact be running that meeting. I have
3 to catch a plane to Italy that afternoon.

4 Depending on the weather forecast, I may be
5 here or may not be here because leaving here and
6 getting back to New York and getting to the airport
7 could strain my marriage, probably. And if I miss
8 that plane -- anyway, so if I don't see you in May,
9 I'll see you in July, and maybe I'll be here in May,
10 and maybe I'll sneak out early. Would that be okay?

11 MR. GOLDBERG: That would be fine with me.

12 MR. ATKINSON: All right. So until then we
13 are adjourned. Thanks very much.

14 (Whereupon, the meeting in the
15 above-entitled matter was concluded.)**North**

16 **American Numbering Council**

17 **Meeting of**

18 **March 14, 2006**

19 **ACTION ITEMS**

20

21 **1. CHAIR:**

22 Determine status of follow-up letter sent to FCC
23 re: Status of INC 407 issue (sent to the FCC in
24 February 2005)

25

1 2. **INC:**

2 Review and if necessary amend NRUF Guidelines to
3 resolve NANC concerns regarding reporting by
4 rural carriers in light of the FCC decision
5 delegating authority to States (ref: submission
6 by Don Gray of the Nebraska PSC)

7